

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

<pre>In re Application of: ) KIMCHI et al. )</pre>	ATTY'S DKT: KIMCHI2A
)	
•	Conf. No. 1652
Appln. No.: 09/719,748 )	
)	Washington, D.C.
Filed: 27 February 2001 )	
	March 12, 2004
For: DAP-KINASE RELATED PROTEIN)	
)	Attn: PETITIONS

## PETITION TO VACATE HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office 2011 South Clark Place Customer Window, Mail Stop Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03 Arlington, Virginia 22202

Sir:

Applicant is in receipt of the Notice of

Abandonment, mailed March 1, 2004, which erroneously states

that the application is abandoned because of applicant's

failure to file a reply within the time period established by

the Office Action mailed June 2, 2003.

It is respectfully requested that such Notice of
Abandonment be vacated as being erroneous and that the present
application be reinstated.

## THE FACTS

Applicant timely and properly responded within the time period established by the Office Action dated June 2,

WFEO

If a fee must be charged, please charge same to Deposit Account No. 02-4035, and then refund said fee as the holding of abandonment is erroneous and is entirely the fault of the PTO.

•3

2003, by timely filing a Reply on October 2, 2003, along with a petition for one month's extension of time.

As evidence that such Reply was timely and properly filed on October 2, 3003, attached hereto is a xerographic copy of the return postcard date-stamped by the PTO Mail Room as having been timely received by the PTO on October 2, 2003.

As it appears that the Reply filed on October 2, 2003, has been lost by and in the PTO, attached hereto is a duplicate copy thereof (entitled "Amendment") dated October 2, 2003, and related papers. However, as the one month's extension fee has already been paid, this executed copy is not to be taken as authorization to charge said extension of time fee. No further fees are required at this time.

## REMARKS

In view of the above evidence, it is clear that a Reply was timely and properly filed within the time period established by the Office Action mailed on June 2, 2003, and that the Notice of Abandonment has been issued in error.

Indeed, the postcard by itself should be sufficient, as MPEP Section 503 states:

A postcard receipt which itemizes and properly identifies the papers which are being filed serves as prima facie evidence of receipt of the PTO of all items listed there on the date stamped thereon by the PTO.

In re Appln. No. 09/719,748 Page 3 March 12, 2004

It accordingly requested that the Notice of Abandonment be vacated and the present application be reinstated.

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

Sheridan Neimark Registration No.

20,520

SN:edg

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\Y\YEDA\Kimchi2a\PTO\patent erroneous abandonment.doc

REPLY BRIEF (TRIPLICATE)
--------------------------

•